

REMARKS

Because the present application is under final rejection, Applicant responds within two months, i.e. by December 13, 2011, so that the Examiner is required to issue an Advisory Action if not a Notice of Allowance. Claims 1, 2 and 4-13 are pending and rejected. Claim 1 remains rejected. Claims 2 and 4-13 are indicated as only objected to. The claims would be allowable if claim 2 (and by virtue of depending therefrom, all of claims 4-13) was combined with claim 1. Applicant appreciates that he overcame the clarity issues under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph of these claims with the last Amendment and Response.

Applicant herein combines all of the recitations of claim 2 into claim 1. As such, no issue of new matter may arise from this amendment. Upon entry of the instant Amendment, claims 1 and 4-13 will be pending, and all of the pending claims will be believed allowable as indicated above.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner continues to object to the drawings as not showing “the manual configuration.” This feature must either be labeled and identified in the drawings or canceled from the claim language. Applicant submits a Replacement Sheet herewith providing a replacement Figure 7 that now contains “the manual configuration,” the “default configuration,” “configuration by extrapolation,” and “configuration by visibility optimization criteria.” In view of a further objection against the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) indicating that all of the structural detail (technical features) must be depicted in the drawings, Applicant submits that all elements (technical features) of claim 2 are present “implicitly” in Figure 7, and more specifically in the “BD Ad Points.” For the sake of clarity, only a few examples of the elements are depicted, named: size, orientation, height, shape, coordinates in the map.

Rejection under 35 USC §103

The Examiner rejects claim 1 as allegedly unpatentable over Hampton et al., U.S. Patent 6,252,522 in view of Nicholson et al., U.S. Patent 6,414,650. The Examiner admits that Hampton et al. do not teach default configuration, configuration by visibility optimization criteria and combinations thereof. However, according to the Examiner, Nicholson et al. teach default configuration, configuration by visibility optimization criteria and combinations thereof (citing column 14, lines 25-67 and column 15, lines 54-64). Therefore, according to the Examiner it would have been obvious to incorporate such into the system of Hampton et al. in order to provide a sign

system for creating extremely light weight, reconfigurable, changeable signs suitable for outdoors. Again, claims 2 and 4-13 are not rejected over the prior art.

In response to Applicant's previous arguments and explanations, the Examiner says that Hampton et al., U.S. Patent 6,252,522 teach visibility zones (potential zone) from which an element to be viewed is visible (citing, Fig. 1 and column 3, lines 15-30), including information that may identify the location of the device and time of day and duration of exposure. The recorded information is subsequently downloaded for processing by a central processing, a data signal carries information regarding the device (billboard), the potential viewer is in a pre-defined exposure area from which the billboard can be viewed, receiving the data signal at a receiver associated with a potential viewer, and storing the information relating to the billboard at the receiver when the potential viewer is in the pre-defined exposure area. Further, according to the Examiner, Nicholson et al. teach a computer system including a memory and a processor for information input and a plurality of information output (citing Fig. 11). Still further, according to the Examiner, Hampton et al. teach a system controlled by the central processor such as a wireless link or computer link so that the receiver provides information to the billboard screen.

As noted, Applicant herein combines claims 1 and 2. As claim 2 is not subject to this rejection, the rejection is hereby rendered moot.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. Expedient acknowledgement as such is earnestly requested. If any issues may be resolved by telephone, please call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

/J. David Smith/

J. David Smith
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 39,839

KLAUBER & JACKSON LLC
Bergen Four
25 E. Spring Valley Avenue, Suite 160
Maywood, NJ 07607
(201) 487-5800